

Serial No. 10/084,254, filed 2/27/02

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 as obvious over Hodgson (US 5,526,292) in view of the Millot article ("Flight test of Active Gear-Mesh Noise Control on the S-76 Aircraft") and further in view of Taylor (U.S. 5,834,918). The Examiner admits that neither Hodgson nor Millot discloses the claimed normalization factor, but argues that the claimed normalization factor would be obvious from Taylor. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although Taylor mentions a "normalization factor," it is not a "normalization factor on a convergence rate," as claimed. Also, Taylor does not disclose a normalization factor that "depends on said estimate . . . wherein said normalization factor is updated based on the update to the estimate," as claimed in claims 1 and 11. Additionally, Taylor discloses adaptive control of motors. There is no suggestion or motivation for using anything taught in Taylor in the noise control system of Millot. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the cited references.

With respect to claims 6 and 16, Taylor does not disclose "treating the updating of the estimate as a portion of a QR decomposition and solving the QR decomposition," as claimed. The Examiner misinterprets the statement in the present application that "the normalization factor can be represented as a QR decomposition." (page 3, lines 4-5). This does not mean that any "normalization factor" is a QR decomposition. Instead, the invention of claims 6 and 16 is choosing to treat the updating of the estimate as a portion of a QR decomposition. Taylor does not treat an update of the estimate as a portion of a QR decomposition. Taylor does not even mention QR decomposition. Therefore, claims 6 and 16 are patentable over the cited references.

With respect to claims 2 and 12, the Examiner admits that Hodgson, Millot and Taylor do not disclose splitting the Cholesky decomposition over more than one iterate. As the Examiner

Serial No. 10/084,254, filed 2/27/02


indicates, Cholesky decomposition itself is known. However, none of the cited references teaches or suggests splitting the Cholesky decomposition over more than one iteration, as claimed.

Claim 21 has been added by this amendment. Claim 21 substantially represent the elements of allowable claim 4, including the base claim and intervening claims, with the exception of intervening claim 2. Claim 21 should be allowable for the same reason that claim 4 is allowable.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-1984 \$200 for one independent claim in excess of three and \$50 for on additional claim in excess of twenty. If any fees or extensions of time are required, please charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1482.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS



John E. Carlson
Registration No. 37,794
400 W. Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: June 7, 2005